arXiv:1405.5236v1 [math.AG] 20 May 2014

XIAO'S CONJECTURE ON CANONICALLY FIBERED SURFACES

XI CHEN

Abstract. A canonically fibered surface is a surface whose canonical series maps it to a curve. Using Miyaoka-Yau inequality, A. Beauville proved that a canonically fibered surface has relative genus at most 5 when its geometric genus is sufficiently large. G. Xiao further conjectured that the relative genus cannot exceed 4. We give a proof of this conjecture.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Statement of the Result.** A dominant rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ between two projective varieties X and Y is a *canonical fibration* if it is given by the canonical series $|K_X|$ of X; more precisely, f is a dominant rational map factored through by $X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}H^0(K_X)^\vee$.

Now let us consider a canonical fibration $f : X \dashrightarrow C$, where

- C1. X and C are irreducible, smooth and projective over $\mathbb{C}$ of dimension $\dim X = 2$ and $\dim C = 1$, respectively,
- C2. X is of general type and
- C3. $|K_X| = f^*\mathcal{D}$ for a base point free (bpf) linear series $\mathcal{D}$ on C that maps C birationally onto its image.

We call such $f : X \dashrightarrow C$ a *canonically fibered surface*. Using Miyaoka-Yau inequality, A. Beauville proved that the general fibers of f are curves of genus ≤ 5 when the geometric genus $p_g(X) = h^0(K_X)$ of X is sufficiently large. There are infinitely many families of canonically fibered surfaces of relative genus 2 and 3 [S]. On the other hand, G. Xiao conjectured [X]

Conjecture 1.1 (Xiao)**.** *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow C$ be a canonically fibered surface. Then $X_p = f^{-1}(p)$ is a curve of genus ≤ 4 for a general point $p \in C$ when $p_g(X) >> 1$.*

In other words, canonically fibered surfaces of relative genus 5 are conjectured to have bounded families. The purpose of this note is to settle the conjecture in the affirmative. More precisely, we will prove

Date: May 20, 2014.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14J29; Secondary 14E05, 14H45.

Key words and phrases. Xiao's Conjecture, Algebraic Surface, Birational Geometry, Canonical Fibration, Family of Curves.

Research partially supported by a grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow C$ be a canonically fibered surface. Then the general fibers of f cannot be curves of genus 5 if $p_g(X) \geq 1952$ or $g(C) \geq 1$.*

1.2. **Outline of Our Proof.** Here is a sketch of our proof.

In the case that a general fiber X_p of f has genus 5, which we called the *extreme case*, we know that

- C is either rational or elliptic (see Theorem 2.1).
- $K_X = f^*D + 8\Gamma + V$, where $8\Gamma + V$ is the fixed part, D is a bpf divisor on C, $f_*V = 0$ and Γ is a section of f (see (3.4)); one of the key facts is that Γ^2 has a lower bound given by (3.5), which is asymptotically

$$\lim_{p_g(X)\to\infty} \frac{\Gamma^2}{p_g(X)} \geq -\frac{1}{8}. \tag{1.1}$$

- The pushforward $f_*\omega_f$ of the dualizing sheaf of f splits in a "highly unbalanced" way (see (2.4)).

Another key fact, due to X.T. Sun [S], is that a general fiber of f is not hyperelliptic. A non-hyperelliptic curve F of genus 5 has a "nice" canonical model: it is mapped to $\mathbb{P}^4$ by $|K_F|$ with the image being the complete intersection of three quadrics. Naturally, we may consider the map

$$\kappa : X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(f_*\omega_f)^\vee = \operatorname{Proj}\left(\oplus \operatorname{Sym}^\bullet f_*\omega_f\right) \tag{1.2}$$

by $\omega_f \otimes f^*G$ for a sufficiently ample line bundle G on C, which simply maps X/C fiberwise to $\mathbb{P}^4$ by the canonical series. Sun's theorem tells us that κ maps X birationally onto its image $\kappa(X)$ and we call $\kappa(X)$ a *relative canonical model* of X over C.

Indeed, $\mathbb{P}(f_*\omega_f)^\vee$ in the above construction can be replaced by $\mathbb{P}(f_*\mathcal{L})^\vee$ for any line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on X satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}\Big|_p \cong \omega_f\Big|_p = \omega_{X_p} \tag{1.3}$$

at a general point $p \in C$. It turns out that

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X(8\Gamma) \tag{1.4}$$

is the best choice of $\mathcal{L}$ for our purpose, where Γ is the section of f given as above. We call the image $Y = \tau(X)$ under $\tau : X \dashrightarrow W = \mathbb{P}(f_*\mathcal{L})^\vee$ a *pseudo relative canonical model* of X over C.

Compared to $\kappa(X)$, Y might have worse singularities. But τ and Y have some nice properties:

- τ is regular;
- Y is normal and Gorenstein;
- τ maps Γ to a section Γ_Y of Y/C and $\Gamma^2 = \Gamma_Y^2$.

These properties, among other things, allow us to give an upper bound (5.22) for Γ^2, which turns out asymptotically

$$\lim_{p_g(X)\to\infty} \frac{\Gamma^2}{p_g(X)} \leq -\frac{47}{368} \tag{1.5}$$

and consequently contradicts (1.1), and thus conclude Theorem 1.2.

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 and §3, we review the known facts about canonically fibered surfaces in general and those of relative genus 5. Most of these results were due to A. Beauville and G. Xiao and no originality is pretended on our part. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 starts in §4, where we construct the pseudo relative canonical model of X/C as described above. And we complete our proof in §5.

Convention. We work exclusively over $\mathbb{C}$ and with analytic topology wherever possible.

2. Basic Setup

Here we review some basic facts on canonically fibered surfaces.

After replacing X by one of its birational models, we may further assume that

C4. f is regular and
C5. K_X is relatively nef over C.

We write K_X as the sum of its moving part and fixed part. It is easy to deduce from our hypotheses that its moving part is the pull back of a divisor on C. Namely, we have

$$K_X = f^*D + N \tag{2.1}$$

where $D \in \mathrm{Pic}(C)$ is a bpf divisor on C and N is an effective divisor on X. Since $|K_X| = f^*\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D} \subset |D|$,

$$H^0(K_X) = H^0(C, D) \tag{2.2}$$

and hence $\mathcal{D} = |D|$. Clearly,

$$h^0(K_X) - h^0(K_X - F) = h^0(D) - h^0(D - p) = 1 \tag{2.3}$$

for a general point p of C and $F = X_p = f^{-1}(p)$.

Combining the above discussion with the well-known fact that the push-forward $f_*\omega_f$ of the dualizing sheaf ω_f of f is semi-positive on C [F], we can prove that C is a curve of genus $g(C) \leq 1$ and X_p is connected.

Theorem 2.1 (Xiao)**.** *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow C$ be a canonically fibered surface. Then*

- *$h^0(K_C) \leq 1$, i.e., C is either rational or elliptic;*
- *f has connected fibers if $p_g(X) \geq 3$ or $g(C) \geq 1$.*

In addition, if f is regular, then

$$f_*K_X = f_*\omega_f \otimes K_C = L \oplus M \tag{2.4}$$

where

- *L is a line bundle satisfying $h^0(L) = p_g(X)$,*
- *$h^0(M) = 0$ and $M \otimes K_C^{-1}$ is semi-positive.*

More explicitly, M is in the form of

$$M = \mathcal{O}(a_1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(a_2) \oplus ... \oplus \mathcal{O}(a_m) \tag{2.5}$$

for some $-2 \leq a_1, a_2, ..., a_m \leq -1$ when $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and

$$M = M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus ... \oplus M_r \tag{2.6}$$

for semi-stable bundles $M_1, M_2, ..., M_r$ satisfying $\deg M_k = h^0(M_k) = 0$ when $g(C) = 1$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Obviously, we may assume that f is regular.

Let L be the subbundle of f_*K_X generated by its global sections. By (2.3),

$$h^0(f_*K_X) - h^0(f_*K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-p)) = 1 \tag{2.7}$$

for $p \in C$ general and hence the global sections of f_*K_X generate a vector space of dimension 1 at a general point $p \in C$. That is, L is a line bundle. Thus, we have a line bundle L such that

$$L \subset f_*K_X = f_*\omega_f \otimes K_C \text{ and } h^0(L) = h^0(f_*K_X). \tag{2.8}$$

Since $f_*\omega_f$ is semi-positive, $\deg(L \otimes K_C^{-1}) \leq \deg f_*\omega_f$. Therefore,

$$h^0(L) \leq \max(g(C), \deg f_*\omega_f + g(C) - 1). \tag{2.9}$$

On the other hand,

$$h^0(f_*K_X) \geq \deg f_*\omega_f + r(g(C) - 1) \tag{2.10}$$

where r is the rank of $f_*\omega_f$. It follows that $g(C) \leq 2$ and the equality holds only if $r = h^0(f_*K_X) = 2$. On the other hand, since $|D|$ maps C birationally onto its image, $h^0(K_X) \geq 3$ by (2.2) when $g(C) \geq 1$. Consequently, $g(C) \leq 1$ and hence

$$h^0(K_X) = h^0(C, D) = d + \chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \tag{2.11}$$

where $d = \deg D$.

Since $H^0(L) = H^0(f_*K_X)$ and $g(C) \leq 1$, the sequence

$$0 \to L \to f_*K_X \to M \to 0 \tag{2.12}$$

must split and give us (2.4).

Finally, to show that f has connected fibers, we apply Stein factorization to X/C in

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\rho} & B \\ & \searrow^{f} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \nu} \\ & & C \end{array} \tag{2.13}$$

if X_p is not connected, where B is a smooth projective curve, $\rho : X \to B$ has connected fibers and ν is a finite map of degree $\deg \nu > 1$. Using the semi-positivity of $\rho_*\omega_{X/B}$, we again obtain that $g(B) \leq 2$ and the equality holds only if $h^0(K_X) = 2$. When $h^0(K_X) = h^0(C, D) = 2$, we must have $g(C) = 0$

and hence $h^0(K_X) \geq 3$ by our hypotheses. Consequently, $1 \geq g(B) \geq g(C)$. In addition, we have

$$h^0(K_X) = h^0(B, \nu^* D) = (\deg \nu)d + \chi(\mathcal{O}_B) > d + \chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \tag{2.14}$$

for $d \geq 2$. This contradicts (2.11) and hence f has connected fibers. □

Miyaoka-Yau inequality ([M] and [Y]) says that

$$9\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) \geq K_X^2. \tag{2.15}$$

Applying this to our situation, since

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^0(K_X) - h^1(\mathcal{O}_X) + 1 \leq h^0(K_X) - h^1(\mathcal{O}_C) + 1 = d - \deg K_C \tag{2.16}$$

by (2.11) and

$$K_X^2 = K_X(f^* D + N) = d \deg K_F + K_X N \tag{2.17}$$

by (2.1), we conclude that

$$(9 - \deg K_F)d - 9 \deg K_C \geq K_X N. \tag{2.18}$$

The right hand side (RHS) of (2.18) can be bounded from below as follows.

We call a component Γ of N vertical if $f_* \Gamma = 0$ and horizontal otherwise. We write

$$N = V + A + B + E \tag{2.19}$$

where V is the union of vertical components of N, A is the union of the horizontal components Γ of N satisfying $\Gamma^2 \geq 0$, B is the union of the components Γ of $N - V - A$ satisfying $K_X \Gamma \geq 0$ and $E = N - V - A - B$.

Clearly, $K_X V \geq 0$ by our hypotheses on X. Since each component $\Gamma \subset A$ is nef, A is nef. And since K_X is effective, $K_X A \geq 0$. In conclusion, we have

$$K_X(V + A + B) \geq 0. \tag{2.20}$$

Also we notice that $K_X \Gamma = \Gamma^2 = -1$ for all components $\Gamma \subset E$. Therefore,

$$K_X N = K_X(V + A + B) + K_X E \geq -\sum_{\Gamma \subset E} \mu_\Gamma \tag{2.21}$$

where μ_Γ is the multiplicity of the component Γ in N.

For a horizontal component Γ of N, we have

$$\deg \omega_\Gamma - \Gamma^2 = K_X \Gamma \geq d m_\Gamma + \mu_\Gamma \Gamma^2, \tag{2.22}$$

where $m_\Gamma = \Gamma F$ satisfies

$$\sum_{\Gamma \subset N} m_\Gamma \mu_\Gamma = \deg K_F. \tag{2.23}$$

Therefore,

$$\mu_\Gamma \geq d m_\Gamma + 1 \tag{2.24}$$

for every component $\Gamma \subset E$ and hence

$$\deg K_F \geq \sum_{\Gamma \subset E} \mu_\Gamma \geq d + 1 \tag{2.25}$$

if $E \neq 0$. Thus, $E = 0$ if $d \geq \deg K_F$ or $g(C) \geq 1$.

Combining (2.18), (2.21) and (2.25), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} (9 - \deg K_F)d + 18 + \deg K_F \geq 0 & \text{if } \deg K_F > d \text{ and } g(C) = 0 \\ (9 - \deg K_F)d - 9 \deg K_C \geq 0 & \text{if } \deg K_F \leq d \text{ or } g(C) \geq 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.26}$$

Then it is elementary to check that $\deg K_F < 10$ if either $d \geq 19$ or $g(C) \geq 1$.

Theorem 2.2 (Beauville)**.** *If $f : X \dashrightarrow C$ is a canonically fibered surface with either $p_g(X) \geq 20$ or $g(C) \geq 1$, then $2 \leq g(F) \leq 5$ for a general fiber F of f.*

3. Analysis of the Extreme Case

Now let us consider the extreme case that

C6. a general fiber F of f is a smooth projective curve of genus 5 and
C7. $p_g(X) >> 1$.

Of course, we want to show that there are no canonically fibered surfaces satisfying C1-C7. Assuming such fibration exists, we will collect all the known facts on such $f : X \to C$.

Let us do a more precise estimate of $K_X N$. By (2.22), we have

$$K_X \Gamma \geq d m_\Gamma + \mu_\Gamma \Gamma^2 \geq d m_\Gamma \tag{3.1}$$

for a component $\Gamma \subset A$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_X \Gamma &\geq \max(d m_\Gamma + \mu_\Gamma \Gamma^2, \deg \omega_\Gamma - \Gamma^2) \\ &\geq \frac{d m_\Gamma}{\mu_\Gamma + 1} + \frac{\mu_\Gamma}{\mu_\Gamma + 1} \deg \omega_\Gamma \geq \frac{d m_\Gamma}{\mu_\Gamma + 1} + \frac{\mu_\Gamma}{\mu_\Gamma + 1} \deg K_C \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for a component $\Gamma \subset B$ and $E = 0$ as long as $d \geq 8$ or $g(C) \geq 1$ by (2.25). It follows that

$$K_X N \geq \sum_{\Gamma \subset A} d m_\Gamma \mu_\Gamma + \sum_{\Gamma \subset B} \left(\frac{d m_\Gamma \mu_\Gamma}{\mu_\Gamma + 1} + \frac{\mu_\Gamma^2}{\mu_\Gamma + 1} \deg K_C \right). \tag{3.3}$$

Then it is not hard to see that (2.18) forces that $A = 0$ and $B = 8\Gamma$ with Γ a section of f, provided that $d \geq 84$ or $g(C) \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$K_X = f^* D + 8\Gamma + V, \tag{3.4}$$

where $f_* V = 0$ and Γ is a section of f. We can bound Γ^2 by

$$\begin{aligned} \boxed{-\frac{d}{8} + \frac{17}{8} \deg K_C} \leq \deg K_C - K_X \Gamma = \Gamma^2 &= -\frac{d}{9} + \frac{\deg K_C}{9} - \frac{\Gamma V}{9} \\ &\leq \boxed{-\frac{d}{9} + \frac{\deg K_C}{9}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

using (2.18).

Theorem 3.1 (Xiao)**.** *If $f : X \to C$ is a canonically fibered surface satisfying C1-C6 and either $p_g(X) \geq 85$ or $g(C) \geq 1$, then K_X is given by* (3.4) *with Γ a section of f satisfying* (3.5)*.*

Here we consider ΓV as the "correction term" in Γ^2 which is roughly between $-d/8$ and $-d/9$. It is bounded by

$$\boxed{0 \leq \Gamma V \leq \frac{d}{8} - \frac{145}{8} \deg K_C}. \tag{3.6}$$

4. Intersections of Three Quadrics

4.1. **A Pseudo Relative Canonical Model of X/C.** As outlined in §1, we consider the rational map

$$\tau : X \dashrightarrow W = \mathbb{P}(f_*\mathcal{L})^\vee = \operatorname{Proj}\left(\oplus \operatorname{Sym}^\bullet f_*\mathcal{L}\right), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X(8\Gamma)$.

More precisely, the map (4.1) is given by $|\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G|$ for a sufficiently ample line bundle G on C, which first maps X to $\mathbb{P}H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G)^\vee$. This is a rational map factoring through $\mathbb{P}(f_*\mathcal{L})^\vee$ via

(4.2)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathbb{P}(f_*\mathcal{L})^\vee \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ X & \dashrightarrow & \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G)^\vee \end{array}$$

where the map $\mathbb{P}(f_*\mathcal{L})^\vee \to \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G)^\vee$ is induced by the surjection

$$H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G) \to f_*\mathcal{L}\Big|_p \tag{4.3}$$

for all $p \in C$.

Fiberwise, τ maps a general fiber $F = X_p$ to $\mathbb{P}^4 = \mathbb{P}H^0(K_F)^\vee$ by the canonical map

$$F \xrightarrow{|K_F|} \mathbb{P}^4. \tag{4.4}$$

If the general fibers F of f are hyperelliptic, τ maps X generically 2-to-1 onto its image. Fortunately, this possibility has been ruled out by a result of X.T. Sun [S]:

Theorem 4.1 (Sun)**.** *If $f : X \to C$ is a canonically fibered surface satisfying C1-C6 and either $p_g(X) \geq 53$ or $g(C) \geq 1$, then the general fibers of f are not hyperelliptic.*

Thus, τ sends X birationally onto its image. Let us study its image, more precisely, the proper transform $Y = \tau(X)$ of X under τ. We consider Y/C as a pseudo relative canonical model of X/C.

The classical Noether's theorem tells us that the canonical image of a non-hyperelliptic curve F of genus 5 under (4.4) is the intersection of three quadrics. Indeed, we have the exact sequence

$$0 \to H^0(I_F(2)) \to \operatorname{Sym}^2 H^0(K_F) \to H^0(2K_F) \to 0 \tag{4.5}$$

where I_F is the ideal sheaf of the image of F in $\mathbb{P}^4$; it follows that

$$\dim H^0(I_F(2)) = 3. \tag{4.6}$$

Namely, the image F of under the canonical map (4.4) is cut out by three quadrics in $\mathbb{P}^4$.

The family version of (4.5) becomes

$$0 \to \mathcal{Q} \to \operatorname{Sym}^2 f_*\mathcal{L} \to f_*(\mathcal{L}^{\otimes 2}). \tag{4.7}$$

Note that (4.7) is only left exact; the map $\operatorname{Sym}^2 f_*\mathcal{L} \to f_*(\mathcal{L}^{\otimes 2})$ is generically surjective by Sun's theorem 4.1 and hence its kernel $\mathcal{Q}$ is a vector bundle of rank 3 over C. In addition, since $f_*(\mathcal{L}^{\otimes 2})$ is torsion-free, we have an injection

$$0 \to \mathcal{Q}_p = \mathcal{Q}\Big|_p \to \operatorname{Sym}^2 f_*\mathcal{L}\Big|_p \tag{4.8}$$

over every point $p \in C$. Thus $\mathcal{Q}_p$ can be regarded as a subspace of $H^0(I_F(2))$ of dimension 3 for every fiber $F = X_p$. In other words, $\mathcal{Q}_p$ is a net (2-dimensional linear series) of quadrics passing through Y_p. Note that Y_p is contained in the base locus $\operatorname{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p)$ of $\mathcal{Q}_p$ but it is not necessarily true that

$$Y_p = \operatorname{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p) \tag{4.9}$$

for every $p \in C$; (4.9) holds, a priori, only for a general point $p \in C$.

We may regard $\mathcal{Q}$ as a subbundle of $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_W(2) \cong \operatorname{Sym}^2 f_*\mathcal{L}$, where

$$\pi : W = \mathbb{P}(f_*\mathcal{L})^\vee \to C \tag{4.10}$$

is the projection and $\mathcal{O}_W(1)$ is the tautological bundle. Thus, $H^0(\mathcal{Q} \otimes G)$ is a subspace of $H^0(\mathcal{O}_W(2) \otimes \pi^*G)$ for $G \in \operatorname{Pic}(C)$.

We abuse notation a little by using $\operatorname{Bs}(\mathcal{Q} \otimes G)$ to denote the base locus of $H^0(\mathcal{Q} \otimes G)$ as a subspace of $H^0(\mathcal{O}_W(2) \otimes \pi^*G)$ and defining

$$Z = \bigcap_{G \in \operatorname{Pic}(C)} \operatorname{Bs}(\mathcal{Q} \otimes G) \subset W. \tag{4.11}$$

Namely, Z is the closed subscheme of W whose fiber Z_p is the intersection of the three quadrics generating $\mathcal{Q}_p$ over each $p \in C$. It is also obvious that $Z = \operatorname{Bs}(\mathcal{Q} \otimes G)$ for a sufficiently ample line bundle G on C.

Clearly, $Y \subset Z$. Indeed, it is easy to see that Y is the only irreducible component of Z that is flat over C; the other irreducible components of Z, if any, must be supported in some fibers W_p of W over C. However, it is not clear whether $\dim Z = 2$ and whether Z has components other than Y. The following theorem answers these questions.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $f : X \to C$ be a flat family of curves of genus 5 over a smooth curve C with X smooth and $X_p = f^{-1}(p)$ non-hyperelliptic for $p \in C$ general and let $\mathcal{L}$ be an effective line bundle on X with $\Lambda \in |\mathcal{L}|$ satisfying*

- *(1.3) holds for $p \in C$ general,*
- *$\Lambda \cap X_p$ is a finite set of points lying on a unique component B_p of X_p for each $p \in C$, and*
- *X_p is smooth at each point in $\Lambda \cap X_p$ for all $p \in C$.*

Let τ, W, $\mathcal{Q}$, Y and Z be defined as above. Then

- *τ is regular and $\tau_* E = 0$ for all components $E \neq B_p$ of X_p and all $p \in C$.*
- *Z is a local complete intersection (l.c.i) of pure dimension 2.*
- *Y is the only irreducible component of Z that is flat over C.*
- *Every quadric of $\mathcal{Q}_p$ has rank ≥ 3 for all $p \in C$, where the rank of a quadric in $\mathbb{P}^N$ is the rank of its defining equation as a quadratic form.*
- *$\dim(Z \cap W_p) = 2$, i.e., Z has an irreducible component contained in W_p if and only if $\mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p)$ is a cone over a smooth rational cubic curve in $\mathbb{P}^4$.*
- *For each $p \in C$, τ maps the component B_p either birationally onto a curve of degree 8 and arithmetic genus 5 or 2-to-1 onto a rational normal curve in $\mathbb{P}^4$.*
- *$\widehat{Y}_p$ is integral (reduced and irreducible) for all $p \in C$ and $Y_p \cong \widehat{Y}_p$ if and only if τ maps B_p birationally onto its image $\tau(B_p)$, where $\nu : \widehat{Y} \to Y \subset W$ is the normalization of Y.*
- *The map $\nu^{-1} \circ \tau : X \to \widehat{Y}$ is a local isomorphism in an open neighborhood of Λ.*

For starters, it is obvious that τ is regular outside of Λ and it contracts all curves $E \subset X$ satisfying $E.\Lambda = 0$ and hence contracts all components of X_p other than B_p. To show that τ is regular everywhere, we make two key observations regarding $\tau(B_p)$:

$$\tau(B_p) \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \text{ is non-degenerate, i.e., } \tau(B_p) \not\subset P \cong \mathbb{P}^3 \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \tag{4.12}$$

for all hyperplanes P of $\mathbb{P}^4$ and

$$p_a(\tau(B_p)) \geq 5 \text{ if } \tau \text{ maps } B_p \text{ birationally onto } \tau(B_p) \tag{4.13}$$

where $p_a(A)$ is the arithmetic genus of a curve A. The first observation (4.12) is a consequence of the following lemma.

4.2. **A Lemma on Fibrations of Curves.**

Lemma 4.3. *Let $f : X \to C$ be a flat projective morphism with connected fibers from a smooth variety X to a smooth curve C. Let D, E and G be effective divisors on X such that*

- *$\mathrm{supp}(D) \not\subset \mathrm{supp}(E)$,*
- *$D + E = F$ for a fiber $F = f^{-1}(p)$ of f and*

- $E \cap G = \emptyset$.

Then $H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-D)) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-F))$.

Proof. It suffices to show that the map

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-D)) \to H^0(\mathcal{O}_E(G-D)) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_E(-D)) \tag{4.14}$$

is zero. This is obvious if F is reduced since $H^0(\mathcal{O}_J) = \mathbb{C}$ for all reduced connected components J of E and hence $H^0(\mathcal{O}_J(-D)) = 0$ as $D+E$ is connected and $D \neq 0$. Note that we do not have $H^0(\mathcal{O}_J) = \mathbb{C}$ in general for a connected (but possibly non-reduced) effective divisor J on X.

Although the lemma holds for fibrations of all dimensions, it is a statement on fibrations of curves in essence. Indeed, by cutting down X by the sections of a sufficiently ample line bundle, we can reduce it to the case $\dim X = 2$.

We write

$$F = \sum \mu_\Gamma \Gamma \tag{4.15}$$

where μ_Γ is the multiplicity of an irreducible component Γ in F. And we let

$$A = \sum a_\Gamma \Gamma \tag{4.16}$$

be the "largest" effective divisor supported on F such that

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-D)) \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-A)) \text{ and} \tag{4.17}$$

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-D)) \not\subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-A-\Gamma)) \tag{4.18}$$

for all irreducible components Γ of F. Obviously, $a_\Gamma \geq \mu_\Gamma$ for all $\Gamma \not\subset E$. And since $\mathrm{supp}(D) \not\subset \mathrm{supp}(E)$, there is at least one irreducible component Γ of F with $a_\Gamma \geq \mu_\Gamma$. Our purpose, of course, is to show that $a_\Gamma \geq \mu_\Gamma$ for all Γ.

For each Γ, we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & I_\Gamma^{a_\Gamma}/I_\Gamma^{a_\Gamma+1} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X/I_\Gamma^{a_\Gamma+1} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X/I_\Gamma^{a_\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \| & & & & & & \\ & & \mathcal{O}_\Gamma(-a_\Gamma\Gamma) & & & & & & \end{array} \tag{4.19}$$

where $I_\Gamma = \mathcal{O}_X(-\Gamma)$ is the ideal sheaf of Γ. By (4.17) and (4.18),

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-A-\Gamma)) \neq H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-A)) \tag{4.20}$$

and hence there is a section $s \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(G-A))$ whose image in

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_X/I_\Gamma^{a_\Gamma+1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(G-(A-a_\Gamma\Gamma))) \tag{4.21}$$

does not vanish. That is, s vanishes to the order exactly a_Γ along Γ. Therefore, s gives a nonzero section in

$$H^0(I_\Gamma^{a_\Gamma}/I_\Gamma^{a_\Gamma+1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(G-(A-a_\Gamma\Gamma)) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_\Gamma(G-A)) \tag{4.22}$$

by (4.19). Thus, $G-A$ is effective on Γ and hence

$$(G-A)\Gamma \geq 0 \tag{4.23}$$

for all $\Gamma \subset F$.

We write $A = M + N$ and $F = M' + N'$, where

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \sum_{a_\Gamma \geq \mu_\Gamma} a_\Gamma \Gamma, N = \sum_{a_\Gamma < \mu_\Gamma} a_\Gamma \Gamma \\ M' &= \sum_{a_\Gamma \geq \mu_\Gamma} \mu_\Gamma \Gamma, N' = \sum_{a_\Gamma < \mu_\Gamma} \mu_\Gamma \Gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

We have shown that $a_\Gamma \geq \mu_\Gamma$ for at least one Γ and hence $M, M' \neq 0$.

Clearly, $\Gamma \subset E$ for all irreducible components $\Gamma \subset N'$. Therefore, $G\Gamma = 0$ for all $\Gamma \subset N'$. Combining this with (4.23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (G - A)\Gamma \geq 0 \Rightarrow -A\Gamma \geq 0 \Rightarrow -N\Gamma \geq M\Gamma \geq M'\Gamma = -N'\Gamma \\ \Rightarrow (N' - N)\Gamma \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

for all $\Gamma \subset N'$ and hence $(N'-N)^2 \geq 0$. Since $M' \neq 0$, every nonzero divisor supported on N' has negative self intersection. Therefore, we necessarily have $N' - N = 0$ and hence $N' = N = 0$. □

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 4.2.** Let us see how to derive (4.12) from Lemma 4.3. By the lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-D)) &= H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-F)) \\ &\cong H^0(f_*\mathcal{L} \otimes G(-p)) \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

where $D = B_p$ and $F = X_p$. Therefore, we have the diagram

(4.27)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(f_*\mathcal{L} \otimes G(-p)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(f_*\mathcal{L} \otimes G) & \longrightarrow & f_*\mathcal{L}\Big|_p & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \| & & \| & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{L}(-D) \otimes f^*G) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes f^*G) & \longrightarrow & H^0(D, \mathcal{L}) & & \end{array}$$

from which we conclude that the map

$$f_*\mathcal{L}\Big|_p \to H^0(D, \mathcal{L}) \tag{4.28}$$

is an injection. It follows that $\tau(D) = \tau(B_p)$ is a non-degenerate curve in $\mathbb{P}^4$. And since $\tau(B_p)$ is irreducible, $\mathcal{Q}_p$ does not contain a quadric of rank ≤ 2, i.e., the union of two hyperplanes. This implies that every member of $\mathcal{Q}_p$ has rank ≥ 3, a general member of $\mathcal{Q}_p$ has rank ≥ 4 and $\mathcal{Q}_p$ contains at most finitely many quadrics of rank 3. Thus, $\dim \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p) \leq 2$ for all $p \in C$. At a general point $p \in C$ where X_p is a smooth non-hyperelliptic curve, we know that $X_p \cong Y_p = Z_p = \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p)$ has dimension 1. Consequently, Z has pure dimension 2, Y is the only component of Z flat over C and Z has a component supported in W_p precisely at the points p where $\dim \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p)$ "jumps". The following lemma tells us exactly how three linearly independent quadrics fail to meet properly.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2))$ be a net of quadrics in $\mathbb{P}^n$. If the base locus $\mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q})$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ has dimension $> n-3$, i.e., the three quadrics generating $\mathcal{Q}$ fail to meet properly, then one of the following holds*

- *every quadric $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ has rank ≤ 4 or*
- *$\mathcal{Q}$ contains a pencil of quadrics of rank ≤ 2.*

Proof. Suppose that a general quadric of $\mathcal{Q}$ has rank ≥ 5 and $\mathcal{Q}$ is generated by Q, Q' and Q'' with $\mathrm{rank}(Q) \geq 5$. Since $\mathrm{Pic}(Q) = \mathbb{Z}$, $Q \cap Q' \cap Q''$ has dimension $\dim Q - 2$ if and only if $\Lambda \subset Q' \cap Q''$ for some hypersurface $\Lambda \subset Q$. Clearly, Λ is a hyperplane section, $Q' = \Lambda \cup \Lambda'$ and $Q'' = \Lambda \cup \Lambda''$ on Q. It follows that $\mathcal{Q}$ contains a pencil of quadrics of rank ≤ 2. □

By the lemma, we see that $\dim \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p) = 2$ only if either every quadrics of $\mathcal{Q}_p$ has rank ≤ 4 or $\mathcal{Q}_p$ has a quadric of rank ≤ 2. We have eliminated the latter by (4.12). This leaves us the former: every quadric of $\mathcal{Q}_p$ is a cone of a common vertex over a quadric in some $P \cong \mathbb{P}^3 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. It is not hard to see further that $\mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p)$ is a cone over a rational normal curve, i.e., a smooth rational cubic curve in P.

Since $\tau(B_p)$ is non-degenerate in $\mathbb{P}^4$, it has degree at least 4. Therefore, τ maps B_p either birationally or 2-to-1 onto to $\tau(B_p)$. If it is the latter, $\tau(B_p)$ must have degree 4 and hence it is a rational normal curve in $\mathbb{P}^4$.

Suppose that τ maps B_p birationally onto $J = \tau(B_p) \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. Let us first justify (4.13), i.e., show that

$$p_a(J) \geq 5. \tag{4.29}$$

This follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let X and Y be two surfaces proper and flat over the unit disk $\Delta = \{|t| < 1\}$ with X_t and Y_t smooth and irreducible for $t \neq 0$. Let $\tau : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a birational map with the diagram*

(4.30)



such that

- *τ is regular on $X \backslash \Sigma$ for a finite set Σ of points on X_0,*
- *X_0 is smooth at each point $x \in \Sigma$,*
- *$\tau_* I \neq 0$ for each component I of X_0 satisfying $I \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$ and*
- *$J = \tau_* X_0$ is reduced.*

Then $p_a(J) \geq g(Y_t)$ for $t \neq 0$.

Proof. WLOG, we may assume that both X and Y are normal.

Let $E \subset Y_0$ be the exceptional locus of τ^{-1} over Σ. More precisely, $E = \pi_Y(\pi_X^{-1}(\Sigma) \cap G_\tau)$ with $G_\tau \subset X \times Y$ the graph of τ and π_X and π_Y the projections of $X \times Y$ to X and Y. It is not hard to see by Zariski's Main Theorem that $\tau : X \backslash \Sigma \to Y \backslash E$ is proper.

After a base change, we can find $\widehat{X}$ and $\widehat{Y}$ with the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{X} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\tau}} & \widehat{Y} \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ X & \overset{\tau}{\dashrightarrow} & Y \end{array} \tag{4.31}$$

and the properties that

- f, g and $\widehat{\tau}$ are birational and proper maps inducing isomorphisms $X\backslash f^{-1}(\Sigma) \cong X\backslash\Sigma$ and $Y\backslash g^{-1}(E) \cong Y\backslash E$ and
- $f^{-1}(U_\Sigma) \cap \widehat{X}_0$ and $g^{-1}(V_E) \cap \widehat{Y}_0$ have simple normal crossing for analytic open neighborhoods $U_\Sigma \subset X$ and $V_E \subset Y$ of Σ and E, respectively.

Since X_0 is smooth at each $x \in \Sigma$, $f^{-1}(x)$ must be a tree of smooth rational curves meeting $\widehat{I}$ transversely at one point, where $\widehat{I}$ is the proper transform of the component I containing x under f. Consequently, $g^{-1}(E) = \widehat{\tau}(f^{-1}(\Sigma))$ is a disjoint union of trees of smooth rational curves, each meeting $\widehat{J}$ transversely at one point, where $\widehat{J}$ is the proper transform of J under g. Therefore, $p_a(J) \geq p_a(\widehat{J}) = p_a(\widehat{Y_0}) = g(Y_t)$. □

This proves (4.29). Let us consider the Hilbert polynomial

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_J(n)) = h^0(\mathcal{O}_J(n)) - h^1(\mathcal{O}_J(n)) = \delta n - p_a(J) + 1 \tag{4.32}$$

of $J \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, where δ is the degree of J in $\mathbb{P}^4$.

Let $R = \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_p)$. If $\dim R = 1$, then

$$h^1(\mathcal{O}_J(1)) \leq h^1(\mathcal{O}_R(1)) = 1 \tag{4.33}$$

and hence

$$5 \leq h^0(\mathcal{O}_J(1)) = \delta - p_a(J) + 1 + h^1(\mathcal{O}_J(1)) \leq \delta - 3 \tag{4.34}$$

by (4.29); it follows that $\delta \geq 8$.

Suppose that $\dim R = 2$. We have proved that R is a cone over a smooth rational cubic curve. Let $\nu : \mathbb{F}_3 \cong \widehat{R} \to R$ be the blowup of R at the vertex of the cone. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathcal{O}_J(n)) &= h^0(\mathcal{O}_J(n)) = h^0(\mathcal{O}_R(n)) - h^0(\mathcal{O}_R(n) \otimes \mathcal{I}_J) \\ &= h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{R}}(n)) - h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{R}}(n) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{R}}(-\widehat{J})) \\ &= \delta n - \left(\left\lceil \frac{\delta}{3} \right\rceil - 1\right)\left(\delta - \frac{3}{2}\left\lceil \frac{\delta}{3} \right\rceil - 1\right) + 1 \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

for $n >> 1$ and hence

$$p_a(J) = \left(\left\lceil \frac{\delta}{3} \right\rceil - 1\right)\left(\delta - \frac{3}{2}\left\lceil \frac{\delta}{3} \right\rceil - 1\right), \tag{4.36}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_J$ is the ideal sheaf of J in R, $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{R}}(1) = \nu^*\mathcal{O}_R(1)$ is the pullback of the hyperplane bundle and $\widehat{J} \subset \widehat{R}$ is the proper transform of J. Therefore, we must have $\delta \geq 8$ by (4.29) again.

Therefore, $\deg J = 8$ when τ maps B_p birationally onto J. We also proved in the above argument that $p_a(J) = 5$.

In conclusion, τ maps B_p either birationally onto a curve of degree 8 and arithmetic genus 5 or 2-to-1 onto a rational normal curve of degree 4. This implies that $\tau(B_p)$ is the only component of dimension 1 in Y_p and hence τ is regular along X_p. Therefore, τ is regular everywhere.

When τ maps B_p birationally onto a curve J. Since $\deg J = 8$ and $p_a(J) = 5$, we necessarily have $\widehat{Y}_p \cong J = Y_p$. When τ maps B_p 2-to-1 onto a rational normal curve J, since $\tau : X \to Y$ factors through $\widehat{Y}$, $\widehat{Y}_p$ is birational to B_p and ν maps $\widehat{Y}_p$ 2-to-1 onto J by Zariski's Main Theorem. Therefore, $\widehat{Y}_p$ is integral for all p.

Since X_p is smooth at $\Lambda \cap X_p$, $X_p \cong \widehat{Y}_p$ for $p \in C$ general and $\widehat{Y}_p$ is reduced for all $p \in C$, we conclude that $\nu^{-1} \circ \tau$ is a local isomorphism along Λ.

This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.2.

4.4. **Normality of Y.** So far we have only made use of the fact that there exists $\Lambda \in |\mathcal{L}|$ which is a multi-section of f and meets each fiber at the smooth points of a unique component of that fiber. We can certainly say more about Y when $\Lambda = 8\Gamma$ with Γ a section of f.

Theorem 4.6. *In addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 4.2, we further assume that $\Lambda = 8\Gamma$ with Γ a section of f. Then Y is normal.*

By Theorem 4.2, Y being normal is equivalent to saying that τ maps B_p birationally onto Y_p for every $p \in C$. Namely, it excludes the cases that τ maps B_p 2-to-1 onto a rational normal curve in $\mathbb{P}^4$. The implication of this statement is somewhat surprising: the family X/C does not have any hyperelliptic fibers. One can compare this with Sun's theorem which says that the general fibers of X/C are not hyperelliptic. If we let $\mathcal{M}_5$ be the moduli space of curves of genus 5 and $\mathcal{U}$ be the subvariety of $\mathcal{M}_5$ consisting of curves F with the property that $K_F = \mathcal{O}_F(8q)$ for some $q \in F$, then $\mathcal{U}$ has codimension 3 in $\mathcal{M}_5$ and contains the hyperelliptic locus $\mathcal{U}_e$ as an "isolated" component in the sense that $\mathcal{U}_e$ is disjoint from the other components of $\mathcal{U}$.

We abuse the notation a little by using Λ to also denote the member of $|\mathcal{O}_W(1)|$ corresponding to $8\Gamma \in |\mathcal{L}|$. On each fiber W_p, Λ is a hyperplane meeting Y_p properly at a unique point with multiplicity 8 by Theorem 4.2. Likewise, $\nu^{-1}(\Lambda)$ meets each fiber $\widehat{Y}_p$ at a unique point. This results in two sections Γ_Y and $\widehat{\Gamma}_Y$ of Y/C and $\widehat{Y}/C$, respectively, with the properties that

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_Y = \nu^{-1}(\Gamma_Y) \text{ and } \Gamma = \tau^{-1}(\Gamma_Y). \tag{4.37}$$

Suppose that τ maps B_p 2-to-1 onto its image, i.e., ν maps $\widehat{Y}_p$ 2-to-1 onto its image for some $p \in C$. Let $\widehat{q} = \widehat{\Gamma}_Y \cap \widehat{Y}_p$ and $q = \Gamma_Y \cap Y_p$. Also by Theorem 4.2, $\widehat{Y}_p$ is smooth at $\widehat{q}$. And since $\nu^{-1}(q) = \{\widehat{q}\}$, ν is ramified at $\widehat{q}$.

In summary, we have the following facts regarding Y and $\widehat{Y}$ locally at q and $\widehat{q}$:

- ν maps $\widehat{Y}_p$ 2-to-1 onto $\mathrm{supp}(Y_p)$, which is a smooth curve;
- Λ is a Cartier divisor on Y such that $\Lambda = 8\Gamma_Y$ and $\nu^*\Lambda = 8\widehat{\Gamma}_Y$ with Γ_Y and $\widehat{\Gamma}_Y$ sections of Y/C and $\widehat{Y}/C$, respectively;
- $\widehat{Y}_p$ is smooth at $\widehat{q} = \widehat{\Gamma}_Y \cap \widehat{Y}_p$;
- ν is ramified at $\widehat{q}$.

It is not hard to see from the above that Y is locally given by

$$\{y^2 = t^{2m}x\} \subset \Delta^3_{xyt} \tag{4.38}$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ at q with Λ cut out by

$$y - \lambda(x,t) = 0 \tag{4.39}$$

for some $\lambda(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x,t]]$ satisfying $\lambda(x,0) = x^4$. And since $\Lambda = 8\Gamma_Y$ on Y, we necessarily have

$$(\lambda(x,t))^2 - t^{2m}x = (x + g(x,t))^8 \tag{4.40}$$

for some $g(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x,t]]$ satisfying $g(x,0) \equiv 0$, which is impossible.

This shows that Y is normal.

4.5. **Multiplicities of Cubic Cones in Z.** We have shown that $Z \subset W$ is the union of Y and cones over a smooth rational cubic curve, which we call *cubic cones*, contained in the fibers W_p. Therefore,

$$Z = Y + \sum_{p \in C} \delta_p S_p, \tag{4.41}$$

where S_p is a cubic cone contained in W_p and δ_p is its multiplicity in Z (let $\delta_p = 0$ and $S_p = \emptyset$ if such S_p does not exist). The multiplicity δ_p has a nice algebraic interpretation.

Definition 4.7. Let E be a vector bundle of rank n over a variety C and $W = \mathbb{P}E^\vee$. For $s \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_W(2) \otimes \pi^*L)$, the *discriminant locus* $D_s \subset C$ of s is the vanishing locus of the determinant $\det(s)$ of s, considered as a section in

$$H^0(\mathrm{Sym}^2 E \otimes \pi^*L) \subset \mathrm{Hom}(E^\vee, E \otimes \pi^*L), \tag{4.42}$$

where π is the projection $W \to C$ and L is a line bundle on C. Obviously, $D_s \in |2c_1(E) + nL|$.

Our purpose is twofold: first, we will show that δ_p is the multiplicity of the discriminant locus of a general member of $\mathcal{Q}$ at p; second, we will describe the type of singularity Y has at the vertex of each cubic cone S_p, which depends on δ_p as we will see.

Theorem 4.8. *Under the same hypotheses of Theorem 4.6,*

- *δ_p is determined by*

$$\delta_p = \min\{\mathrm{mult}_p(D_s) : s \in H^0(\mathcal{Q} \otimes \pi^*G), G \in \mathrm{Pic}(C)\} \tag{4.43}$$

for all $p \in C$, where $D_s \subset C$ is the discriminant locus of s defined as above and $\mathrm{mult}_p(D_s)$ is the multiplicity of D_s at p.

- *Y is a l.c.i and hence Gorenstein.*
- *If $S_p \neq \emptyset$, Y has a singularity at the vertex of the cone S_p of type $\{y^2 = g(x,t)\} \subset \Delta^3_{xyt}$ with $g(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x,t]]$ satisfying*

$$g(x,0) \not\equiv 0, g(0,t) = t^{\delta_p} \text{ and } \left.\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|_{x=0} \equiv 0, \tag{4.44}$$

where t is the local parameter of C at p.

The problem is obviously local: we just have to study W, X, Y, Z and $\mathcal{Q}$ over an open neighborhood of $p \in C$. Thus, it suffices to prove the following:

Lemma 4.9. *Let $W = \mathbb{P}^4 \times \Delta$, $\mathcal{Q}$ be a subbundle of $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_W(2)$ of rank 3 and $Z = \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q})$, where $\Delta = \{|t| < 1\}$, π is the projection $W \to \Delta$, $\mathcal{O}_W(1)$ is the pullback of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)$ and $\mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q})$ is the base locus of $H^0(\mathcal{Q})$ as a subspace of $H^0(\mathcal{O}_W(2))$. Suppose that*

- *$Z_t = \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_t)$ is a smooth curve for $t \neq 0$;*
- *$Z = Y + \delta S$, where $S = \mathrm{Bs}(\mathcal{Q}_0)$ is a cubic cone, δ is the multiplicity of S in Z and Y is the irreducible component of Z flat over Δ;*
- *Y_0 is not contained in a union of lines on S passing through its vertex.*

Then

- *δ is determined by*

$$\delta = \min\{\mathrm{mult}_0(D_s) : s \in H^0(\mathcal{Q})\}. \tag{4.45}$$

- *Y is a l.c.i and hence Gorenstein.*
- *If Y_0 is reduced, Y has a singularity at the vertex of the cone S of type $\{y^2 = g(x,t)\} \subset \Delta^3_{xyt}$ with $g(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x,t]]$ satisfying*

$$g(x,0) \not\equiv 0, g(0,t) = t^{\delta} \text{ and } \left.\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|_{x=0} \equiv 0. \tag{4.46}$$

Proof. Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two general members of $H^0(\mathcal{Q})$ and let $V = Q_1 \cap Q_2$. It is easy to see that $V_0 = S \cup T$, where $T \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ is a 2-plane meeting S along two distinct lines passing through the vertex q of S. Since V_t is smooth for $t \neq 0$ and S and T meet transversely outside of q, V is a 3-fold locally given by $xy = t^m$ in Δ^4_{xyzt} at a general point of $S \cap T$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is a constant on each line in $S \cap T$. As Q_1 and Q_2 vary, T varies and the corresponding monodromy action on the two lines in $S \cap T$ is transitive. Therefore, m remains constant at general points of $S \cap T$. Thus, V is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial outside of finitely many points on $S \cap T$. More precisely, there exists $\Sigma \subset S \cap T$ such that $\dim \Sigma = 0$ and $\mathrm{CH}^1(V \backslash \Sigma)$ is generated by Λ and S, where Λ is the hyperplane divisor and $a\Lambda + bS$ is Cartier on $V \backslash \Sigma$ if and only if $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b \in m\mathbb{Z}$.

Clearly, $Z \sim_{\mathrm{rat}} 2\Lambda$ and hence

$$Y = 2\Lambda - \delta S \tag{4.47}$$

in $\mathrm{CH}^1(V\backslash\Sigma)$. Note that Y is, a priori, a Weil divisor on V. Restricting Y to T, we have

$$Y\Big|_T = 2\Lambda - \delta S\Big|_T = \left(2 - \frac{2\delta}{m}\right)\Lambda \tag{4.48}$$

in $\mathrm{CH}^1_{\mathbb{Q}}(T\backslash\Sigma)$. And since $Y_0 \subset S$, Y meets T at finitely many points and hence $Y.T = 0$. Indeed, although we do not need it, it is not hard to see that Σ is precisely $Y \cap T$. In any event, we can conclude that $m = \delta$ by (4.48).

In addition, Y is Cartier on $V\backslash\Sigma$ by (4.47) since $m|\delta$. Therefore, $Y\backslash\Sigma$ is a l.c.i. Recall that Q_1 and Q_2 are two general members of $H^0(\mathcal{Q})$ and Σ is a set of finitely many points on $S \cap T$. As Q_1 and Q_2 vary, T varies and it cuts out on S a linear system of two lines $S \cap T$ with the only base point q. Therefore, we conclude that Y is a l.c.i outside of the vertex q.

Let W be parameterized by $(w_0, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, t)$ with $(w_0, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ the homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^4$. Obviously, we may choose the vertex q of S to be $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. Furthermore, we claim that for a suitable choice of coordinates, or equivalently, after applying a suitable automorphism in $\mathrm{Aut}(W/\Delta)$ to W, every $s \in H^0(\mathcal{Q})$ is given by $s = s(w_0, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, t)$ satisfying

$$\frac{\partial^{j+1} s}{\partial w_0 \partial t^j}\bigg|_{t=0} = 0 \text{ for } j = 0, 1, 2, ..., \mu - 1 \tag{4.49}$$

with μ given by the RHS of (4.45). To see this, let us consider $\mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^\mu)$. By the definition of μ, every quadric in $H^0(\mathcal{Q}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^\mu)$ has rank ≤ 4 over $\mathbb{C}[t]/(t^\mu)$. And since a general quadric in $H^0(\mathcal{Q}_0)$ has a unique singularity at q, we conclude that every quadric in $H^0(\mathcal{Q}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^\mu)$ has a singularity at $(1, q_1(t), q_2(t), q_3(t), q_4(t))$ for some $q_k(t) \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ satisfying $q_k(0) = 0$. Then applying the automorphism in $\mathrm{Aut}(W/\Delta)$ sending

$$\begin{aligned} &(w_0, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, t) \\ &\to (w_0, w_1 - q_1(t)w_0, w_2 - q_2(t)w_0, w_3 - q_3(t)w_0, w_4 - q_4(t)w_0, t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

we see that every quadric in $H^0(\mathcal{Q}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^\mu)$ is singular at $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ and thus (4.49) holds.

We can make everything more explicit by choosing S to be the cone

$$w_1w_4 - w_2w_3 = w_2^2 - w_1w_3 = w_3^2 - w_2w_4 = t = 0 \tag{4.51}$$

and choosing a basis s_1, s_2 and s_3 of $H^0(\mathcal{Q})$, as a free module over $\mathbb{C}[[t]]$, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} s_1(w, 0) &= w_1w_4 - w_2w_3 \\ s_2(w, 0) &= w_2^2 - w_1w_3 \\ s_3(w, 0) &= w_3^2 - w_2w_4 \end{aligned} \tag{4.52}$$

where $w = (w_0, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$. Note that S is the cone in $\mathbb{P}^4$ over the cubic rational normal curve $(0, 1, x, x^2, x^3)$ with vertex at $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$.

Furthermore, after an automorphism of W/Δ, we may assume s_1 to be

$$s_1(w,t) = w_1w_4 - w_2w_3 + t^\mu w_0^2. \tag{4.53}$$

Note that $w_1w_4 - w_2w_3$, $w_2^2 - w_1w_3$ and $w_3^2 - w_2w_4$ generate $H^0(I_S(2))$ with syzygy relations

$$\begin{aligned} &w_2(w_1w_4 - w_2w_3) + w_3(w_2^2 - w_1w_3) + w_1(w_3^2 - w_2w_4) = 0\\ &w_3(w_1w_4 - w_2w_3) + w_4(w_2^2 - w_1w_3) + w_2(w_3^2 - w_2w_4) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.54}$$

where I_S is the ideal sheaf of S in $\mathbb{P}^4$. In addition, we have a surjection

$$H^0(I_S(2)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_S(1)) \twoheadrightarrow H^0(I_S(3)). \tag{4.55}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} w_2s_1 + w_3s_2 + w_1s_3 &= t^m f_1(w,t) + t\varepsilon_1(w,t)\\ w_3s_1 + w_4s_2 + w_2s_3 &= t^m f_2(w,t) + t\varepsilon_2(w,t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.56}$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in H^0(I_Z(3))$ and $f_1, f_2 \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_W(3))$ satisfying that $f_1(w,0)$ and $f_2(w,0)$ do not both vanish when restricted to S, where I_Z is the ideal sheaf of Z in W.

Obviously, $f_1, f_2 \in H^0(I_Y(3))$; namely,

$$Y \subset \{f_1(w,t) = f_2(w,t) = 0\}. \tag{4.57}$$

In addition, it is easy to see that m is exactly the multiplicity of S in Z, i.e., $m = \delta$.

It is not hard to see that $m \leq \mu$ by (4.53). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(w,0) &= w_2h_1 + w_3h_2 + w_1h_3\\ f_2(w,0) &= w_3h_1 + w_4h_2 + w_2h_3 \end{aligned} \tag{4.58}$$

where $h_1(w), h_2(w)$ and $h_3(w)$ are quadratic forms in w,

$$h_1(w) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m < \mu \\ w_0^2 & \text{if } m = \mu \end{cases} \tag{4.59}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial h_2}{\partial w_0} = \frac{\partial h_3}{\partial w_0} \equiv 0 \text{ if } m < \mu \tag{4.60}$$

by (4.49). If $m < \mu$, then by (4.57), $Y_0 \subset \{f_1 = f_2 = 0\} \cap S$, which is a union of lines passing through q by (4.59) and (4.60); this contradicts our hypotheses on Y. Therefore, $m = \mu$. Combining it with the fact $m = \delta$, we conclude that $\delta = \mu$. Namely, $Z = Y + \delta S$ with δ given by (4.45).

It remains to study the local behavior of Y at the vertex q. Here we use the affine coordinates of W by setting $w_0 = 1$. Let us consider the subscheme

$$Y' = \{s_1(w,t) = f_1(w,t) = f_2(w,t) = 0\} \tag{4.61}$$

of W. By (4.57), $Y \subset Y'$.

We observe that the Jacobian

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial w_1} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial w_2} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial w_3} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial w_4} \\ \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial w_1} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial w_2} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial w_3} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial w_4} \end{bmatrix}_q = \begin{bmatrix} h_3(q) & 1 & h_2(q) & 0 \\ 0 & h_3(q) & 1 & h_2(q) \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.62}$$

has rank 2 at q. Therefore, using implicit function theorem, we see that Y' is locally given by $\{y^2 = g(x,t)\} \subset \Delta^3_{xyt}$ at q with $g(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x,t]]$ satisfying

$$g(0,t) = t^\delta \text{ and } \left.\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|_{x=0} \equiv 0. \tag{4.63}$$

It follows that Y' is a reduced l.c.i at q and is either irreducible or the union of two irreducible components $y = \pm\sqrt{g(x,t)}$ at q. If it is the latter and $Y \subset Y'$ is one of the two components, then Y_0 is smooth at q; on the other hand, Y_0 is a curve of degree 8 on the cubic cone S and thus must be singular at q. Therefore, $Y = Y'$ in an open neighborhood of q.

If $g(x,0) \equiv 0$, then Y_0 is clearly nonreduced. Therefore, Y has a singularity of type (4.46) at q if Y_0 is reduced. □

5. Numerical Computations on the Pseudo Relative Canonical Model

5.1. **Numerical Invariants of W and Z.** We have constructed a pseudo relative canonical model Y/C of X/C in the previous section. The local study of Y has made it possible to carry out numerical computations on Y, as a subvariety of W. We start with the computation of a few simple numerical invariants of W and Z.

Note that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X(8\Gamma)$ is a sub-bundle of $K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-V - f^*D)$,

$$h^0(\mathcal{L}) = 1 \text{ and } H^0(\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(f^*D)) = H^0(K_X) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_C(D))) \tag{5.1}$$

by (2.2) and (3.4). Thus, combining with (2.4), we see that

$$f_*\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_C \oplus A \tag{5.2}$$

where A is a vector bundle of rank 4 on C satisfying that

$$H^0(A(D)) = H^0(A \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(D)) = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Clearly,

$$\Lambda^5 = \Lambda^4.\pi^* c_1(f_*\mathcal{L}) = c_1(A) \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\omega_W = -5\Lambda + \pi^* K_C + \pi^* c_1(A) \tag{5.5}$$

where π is the projection $W \to C$.

The ideal sheaf I_Z of $Z \subset W$ can be resolved by the Koszul complex

$$0 \to \wedge^3\pi^*\mathcal{Q} \to \wedge^2\pi^*\mathcal{Q} \to \pi^*\mathcal{Q} \to I_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_W(2) \to 0. \tag{5.6}$$

It follows that

$$Z = -c_3(\pi^*\mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{O}_W(-2)) = 8\Lambda^3 - 4\Lambda^2\pi^* c_1(\mathcal{Q}) \tag{5.7}$$

in $\mathrm{CH}_2(W)$ and

$$\mathcal{N}_Z = (I_Z/I_Z^2)^\vee = (\pi^*\mathcal{Q})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_W(2)\Big|_Z \tag{5.8}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_Z$ is the normal sheaf of Z in W.

5.2. **Intersection Number $\Lambda^2 Y$.** Since

$$\Lambda\Big|_Y = 8\Gamma_Y \text{ and } \tau^*\Lambda = 8\Gamma, \tag{5.9}$$

we have

$$\Gamma^2 = \Gamma_Y^2 = \frac{1}{8}\Lambda\Gamma_Y = \frac{1}{64}\Lambda^2 Y, \tag{5.10}$$

where the intersection number Γ_Y^2 is taken in Y.

We need to figure out $\Lambda^2 Y$. By (4.41),

$$\Lambda^2 Y = \Lambda^2 Z - \sum_{p\in C}\delta_p \Lambda^2 S_p = \Lambda^2 Z - 3\delta \tag{5.11}$$

since $\deg S_p = 3$ in $W_p \cong \mathbb{P}^4$, where $\delta = \sum \delta_p$.

Combining (5.4), (5.7), (5.10) and (5.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 64\Gamma^2 = 64\Gamma_Y^2 &= 8\Lambda\Gamma_Y = \Lambda^2 Y = 8\Lambda^5 - 4\Lambda^4\pi^* c_1(\mathcal{Q}) - 3\delta \\ &= 8c_1(A) - 4c_1(\mathcal{Q}) - 3\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

5.3. **Dualizing Bundles ω_Y and ω_Z.** By (5.5), (5.8) and adjunction, we have

$$\omega_Z = \omega_W\Big|_Z + c_1(\mathcal{N}_Z) = (\Lambda + \pi^*K_C + \pi^*c_1(A) - \pi^*c_1(\mathcal{Q}))\Big|_Z. \tag{5.13}$$

At a smooth point of Y_p, Z is locally given by $yt^{\delta_p} = 0$ in Δ^3_{xyt} with $Y = \{y = 0\}$ and $S_p = \{t = 0\}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_Y &= \omega_Z\Big|_Y - \sum_{p\in C}\delta_p Y_p \\ &= \pi_Y^*(\underbrace{K_C + c_1(A) - c_1(\mathcal{Q}) - \sum \delta_p p}_{D_Y}) + 8\Gamma_Y \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where π_Y is the projection $Y \to C$.

5.4. **Adjunction on (Y, Γ_Y).** By Theorem 4.2 and 4.6, Y is smooth along Γ_Y. Therefore, adjunction applies to (Y, Γ_Y) and produces

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(K_C) = c_1(K_{\Gamma_Y}) &= (\omega_Y + \Gamma_Y)\Gamma_Y \\ &= c_1(K_C) + c_1(A) - c_1(\mathcal{Q}) - \delta + 9\Gamma_Y^2 \\ &= c_1(K_C) + \frac{17}{8}c_1(A) - \frac{25}{16}c_1(\mathcal{Q}) - \frac{91}{64}\delta \\ &\Rightarrow c_1(\mathcal{Q}) = \frac{34}{25}c_1(A) - \frac{91}{100}\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Combining (5.12) and (5.15), we reach the following crucial identity

$$\boxed{\delta = 100\Gamma^2 - 4c_1(A)}. \tag{5.16}$$

Next, we claim that

$$\boxed{\chi(X) - \chi(F)\chi(C) = 12\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) - K_X^2 + 16\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \geq \delta - 2\Gamma V} \tag{5.17}$$

where F is a general fiber of f and $\chi(X), \chi(F)$ and $\chi(C)$ are the (topological) Euler characteristics of X, F and C, respectively. The left hand side (LHS) of (5.17) measures, roughly, how far X is from a smooth fibration; clearly, $\chi(X) = \chi(F)\chi(C)$ if every fiber of f is smooth.

Let us first see how to derive our main theorem from (5.16) and (5.17). Using (2.16) and (3.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &12\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) - K_X^2 + 16\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \\ &\leq 12(d + 2\chi(\mathcal{O}_C)) - K_X(f^*D + 8\Gamma + V) + 16\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \\ &\leq 12(d + 2\chi(\mathcal{O}_C)) - K_X(f^*D + 8\Gamma) + 16\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \\ &= 4d + 8\Gamma^2 + 40\chi(\mathcal{O}_C). \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

Therefore, we conclude

$$4d + 8\Gamma^2 + 40\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \geq \delta - 2\Gamma V \tag{5.19}$$

by (5.17). Thus, (5.16) and (5.19) give us an upper bound for Γ^2 in

$$\Gamma^2 \leq \frac{d + c_1(A)}{23} + \frac{10}{23}\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) + \frac{\Gamma V}{46}. \tag{5.20}$$

The fact that $H^0(A(D)) = 0$ implies that

$$c_1(A) \leq -4d - 4\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \tag{5.21}$$

by Riemann-Roch. Consequently,

$$\Gamma^2 \leq -\frac{3}{23}d + \frac{6}{23}\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) + \frac{\Gamma V}{46} \leq -\frac{47}{368}d + \frac{193}{184}\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \tag{5.22}$$

by (3.6). Combining with (3.5), we have

$$-\frac{d}{8} - \frac{17}{4}\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \leq -\frac{47}{368}d + \frac{193}{184}\chi(\mathcal{O}_C), \tag{5.23}$$

which fails for $d > 1950\chi(\mathcal{O}_C)$. This proves Theorem 1.2, provided that (5.17) holds. The rest of the paper will be devoted to the proof of (5.17).

5.5. **Regarding ΓV.** Before we explain where (5.17) comes from, let us first try to understand the term ΓV. We claim that ΓV is determined by the discrepancies of the map $\tau_Y : X \to Y$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} f^*D + 8\Gamma + V = K_X &= \tau_Y^*\omega_Y + \sum a(E, Y)E \\ &= f^*D_Y + 8\Gamma + \sum a(E, Y)E \end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

where D_Y is the divisor on C defined in (5.14), E runs over all exceptional divisors of τ and $a(E,Y)$ is the discrepancy of E with respect to Y. For each fiber X_p, we let b_p be the smallest rational number such that the divisor

$$\sum_{E\subset X_p} a(E,Y)E + b_p X_p \tag{5.25}$$

is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective. Clearly, $b_p = 0$ at a general point $p \in C$ and when $a(E,Y) \geq 0$ for all $E \subset X_p$, i.e., Y has at worst canonical singularities along Y_p. More explicitly, b_p is simply given by

$$b_p = \max_{E\subset X_p} \left(0, -\frac{a(E,Y)}{\mathrm{mult}_E(X_p)}\right) \tag{5.26}$$

where $\mathrm{mult}_E(X_p)$ is the multiplicity of the component E in X_p.

We can put (5.24) in the form

$$f^*D + V = f^*\left(D_Y - \sum b_p p\right) + \left(\sum a(E,Y)E + \sum b_p X_p\right). \tag{5.27}$$

Obviously, either side of (5.27) is a Zariski decomposition of the same divisor. By the uniqueness of Zariski decomposition, we conclude that

$$V = \sum a(E,Y)E + \sum b_p X_p. \tag{5.28}$$

And since $\Gamma E = 0$ for all exceptional divisors E of τ, we have

$$\Gamma V = \sum_{p\in C} b_p. \tag{5.29}$$

5.6. **Moduli Invariants.** If $f : X \to C$ is semistable, the LHS of (5.17) is given by the moduli invariants $c_1(f_*\omega_f)$ and $f_*(\omega_f^2)$ in (cf. [H-M, p. 154])

$$\chi(X) - \chi(F)\chi(C) = 12\deg f_*\omega_f - \omega_f^2 = \eta \tag{5.30}$$

where η is the total number of nodes of the singular fibers of f. This follows from Grothendieck-Riemann-Roch and the exact sequence

$$0 \to f^*\Omega_C \to \Omega_X \to \omega_f \to \omega_f \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \to 0 \tag{5.31}$$

where $\Sigma \subset X$ is the subscheme of the nodes of the singular fibers of f.

We want to generalize (5.30) to fibrations $f : X \to C$ of curves with the only hypotheses that both X and C are smooth and projective. Of course, we can still define η to be the LHS of (5.30). The point here is to understand how the singular loci of the fibers of f contribute to η.

Basically, we need to figure out how to amend the exact sequence (5.31) when X/C is not necessarily semistable. The trouble here is, of course, that X_p might be nonreduced for some p. In case that X/C has reduced fibers, (5.31) continues to hold with Σ being the subscheme supported at the singularities of X_p and locally defined by the Jacobian ideal at each singular point. More precisely, if X is locally given by $g(x,y) = t$ at $q \in X$, Σ is locally cut out by $\partial g/\partial x = \partial g/\partial y = 0$, where t is the local parameter of the

base C. Thus, a node of X_p at q (i.e. $g(x,y)=xy$) contributes 1 to η, a cusp of X_p at q (i.e. $g(x,y)=x^2-y^3$) contributes 2 to η and so on.

Let us first see how to define the map $\Omega_X \to \omega_f$ in general. For a vector bundle (or just a coherent sheaf) E over X, we always has a map

$$E \xrightarrow{\wedge s} \wedge^2 E \tag{5.32}$$

after fixing a section $s \in H^0(E)$. The natural map $f^*\Omega_C \to \Omega_X$ gives rise to a section of $\Omega_X \otimes (f^*\Omega_C)^\vee$ and thus induces a map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_X \otimes (f^*\Omega_C)^\vee & \longrightarrow & \wedge^2(\Omega_X \otimes (f^*\Omega_C)^\vee) \\ \| & & \| \\ \Omega_X \otimes f^*K_C^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \omega_f \otimes f^*K_C^{-1}. \end{array} \tag{5.33}$$

Therefore, we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker(\rho) & \longrightarrow & \Omega_X & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \omega_f & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{coker}(\rho) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \| & & & & & & \| & & \\ & & L & & & & & & \omega_f \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Sigma & & \end{array} \tag{5.34}$$

as a generalization of (5.31), where an easy local study shows that $L=\ker(\rho)$ is a line bundle on X and Σ is the subscheme of X defined by the Jacobian ideals of X_p as above. More explicitly, if we let $\Sigma=\Sigma_0\cup\Sigma_1$ with Σ_0 of pure dimension 0 and Σ_1 of pure dimension 1, then

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum (\operatorname{mult}_G(X_p)-1)G = \sum_{p\in C} \left(X_p - (X_p)_{\mathrm{red}}\right) \tag{5.35}$$

where G runs over all irreducible components of X_p for all p and $(X_p)_{\mathrm{red}}$ is the largest reduced subscheme supported on X_p.

Taking Chern characters of (5.34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{ch}(\omega_f) - \operatorname{ch}(\Omega_X) = \operatorname{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_0}) + \operatorname{ch}(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_1}) - \operatorname{ch}(L) \\ &= \operatorname{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_0}) + (\exp(\omega_f) - \exp(\omega_f - \Sigma_1)) - \exp(c_1(L)). \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

Restricting (5.36) to $\mathrm{CH}^1(X)$ yields

$$-f^*K_C = \Sigma_1 - c_1(L) \tag{5.37}$$

and hence

$$L \cong f^*\Omega_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(\Sigma_1). \tag{5.38}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(X)-\chi(F)\chi(C) &= \frac{\omega_f^2}{2}-\frac{K_X^2-2c_2(X)}{2}\\ &= \mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_0})+(\omega_f\Sigma_1-\Sigma_1^2)\\ &= \mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_0})+\sum_{p\in C}K_X\big(X_p-(X_p)_{\mathrm{red}}\big)-\sum_{p\in C}\big(X_p-(X_p)_{\mathrm{red}}\big)^2\\ &= \mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_0})+\sum_{p\in C}2\Big(p_a(X_p)-p_a\big((X_p)_{\mathrm{red}}\big)\Big)=\eta\end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

by restricting (5.36) to $H^4(X)$.

Definition 5.1. Let G be an effective divisor on a smooth surface X. Then the *η-invariant* of G is

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(G) &= \underbrace{\sum_{q\in G}\eta_0(G,q)}_{\eta_0(G)}+\underbrace{K_X(G-G_{\mathrm{red}})+(G^2-G_{\mathrm{red}}^2)}_{\eta_1(G)}\\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{q\in G}\eta_0(G,q)}_{\eta_0(G)}+\underbrace{2\big(p_a(G)-p_a(G_{\mathrm{red}})\big)}_{\eta_1(G)}\end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

with $\eta_0(G,q)$ defined by

$$\nu_q=\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X,q}/(g_{\mathrm{red}}\frac{\partial(\log g)}{\partial x},g_{\mathrm{red}}\frac{\partial(\log g)}{\partial y})\right), \tag{5.41}$$

where $g(x,y)$ and $g_{\mathrm{red}}(x,y)$ are the local defining equations of G and G_{red} at q, respectively, i.e.,

$$g_{\mathrm{red}}(x,y)=g_1(x,y)g_2(x,y)...g_l(x,y) \tag{5.42}$$

if G is given by $g(x,y)=g_1^{m_1}(x,y)g_2^{m_2}(x,y)...g_l^{m_l}(x,y)=0$ in $X\cong\Delta^2_{xy}$ at q with $g_1(x,y),g_2(x,y),...,g_l(x,y)\in\mathbb{C}[[x,y]]$ irreducible.

We can summarize our previous discussion in the following proposition:

Proposition 5.2. *Let $f:X\to C$ be a surjective morphism from a smooth projective surface X to a smooth projective curve C. Then*

$$\chi(X)-\chi(F)\chi(C)=\sum_{p\in C}\eta(X_p) \tag{5.43}$$

where F is a general fiber of f.

It is not hard to see that the η-invariant of a fiber is always nonnegative: $\eta_0(G)\geq 0$ obviously and $\eta_1(G)\geq 0$ by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $G\subset X$ be an effective divisor on a normal surface X. Suppose that X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein, G and G_{red} are Cartier, $G^2=0$ and G is nef. The following holds:*

- *For a smooth surface Y and a proper birational map $f : Y \to X$,*

$$\eta_1(f^*G) \geq \eta_1(G). \tag{5.44}$$

- *$\eta_1(G) \geq 0$ if X is smooth.*

Proof. First we show that (5.44) holds when $K_Y E \geq 0$ for all exceptional curves E of f, i.e., K_Y is f-nef. Let us consider

$$M = f^*G_{\mathrm{red}} - (f^*G)_{\mathrm{red}}. \tag{5.45}$$

Clearly, $f^*G \geq M \geq 0$ and $f_*M = 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1(f^*G) - \eta_1(G) &= -2p_a((f^*G)_{\mathrm{red}}) + 2p_a(G_{\mathrm{red}}) \\ &= (K_X G_{\mathrm{red}} + G_{\mathrm{red}}^2) - (K_Y(f^*G)_{\mathrm{red}} + (f^*G)_{\mathrm{red}}^2) \\ &= K_Y M - M^2 \end{aligned} \tag{5.46}$$

since $p_a(f^*G) = p_a(G)$ and $M.f^*G_{\mathrm{red}} = 0$, obviously.

By our hypotheses on G, $F^2 \leq 0$ for all effective divisors F supported on f^*G. Therefore, $M^2 \leq 0$. And since $K_Y M \geq 0$, we conclude that $\eta_1(f^*G) \geq \eta_1(G)$ if K_Y is f-nef.

Next, we claim that (5.44) holds when both X and Y are smooth. It suffices to prove it for $f : Y \to X$ the blowup of X at a point. This is more or less obvious since $M = mE$ in (5.46), where E is the exceptional divisor of f. This proves (5.44).

If $K_X E \geq 0$ for all components $E \subset G$, then

$$\eta_1(G) = K_X(G - G_{\mathrm{red}}) - G_{\mathrm{red}}^2 \geq 0 \tag{5.47}$$

since $G_{\mathrm{red}}^2 \leq 0$.

If X is smooth and $K_X E < 0$ for some component $E \subset G$, then E is a (-1)-curve and it can be blown down via $\pi : X \to X'$. Then $\eta_1(G) \geq \eta_1(G')$ by (5.44), where $G' = \pi_* G$. By induction, we conclude that $\eta_1(G) \geq 0$ if X is smooth. □

Now back to (5.17), as a consequence of Proposition 5.2, we see that it holds provided that we can prove

$$\sum_{p \in C} \eta(X_p) \geq \delta - 2\Gamma V. \tag{5.48}$$

By Theorem 4.8, we know that Y has a double point of type (4.44) at the vertex of each cubic cone S_p. And by Lemma 5.3, all the local contributions to $\eta(X_p)$ is nonnegative. Therefore, we can further reduce (5.48) to the following:

$$\eta(X_p \cap \tau^{-1}(U_p)) \geq \delta_p - 2b_p \tag{5.49}$$

where U_p is an open neighborhood of the vertex of S_p in W and b_p is the number defined in (5.26).

Finally, we just have to prove (5.49), which implies (5.17) and hence our main theorem. So it comes down to the study of a double surface singularity of type (4.46).

5.7. **Double Surface Singularities.** Here we consider an isolated surface singularity of multiplicity 2. More explicitly, we consider

$$Y = \{y^2 = g(x,t)\} \subset \Delta^2_{xyt} \tag{5.50}$$

for some $g(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x,t]]$ satisfying $g(x,0) \not\equiv 0$. We also regard Y as a family of curves over Δ_t.

The simplest way to resolve the singularity of Y is to consider it as a double cover over $U = \Delta^2_{xt}$ ramified along the curve $R = \{g(x,t) = 0\}$, find a suitable embedded resolution $(\widehat{U}, \widehat{R})$ of (U,R) and then construct the double cover of $\widehat{U}$ ramified along $\widehat{R}$. Actually, the algorithm is very simple and straightforward: Find the "minimal" birational map $u : \widehat{U} \to U$ such that

- $\widehat{U}$ and all components of u^*R are smooth;
- if the components $G_1, G_2, ..., G_m$ of u^*R meet at a point, all but at most one of $G_1, G_2, ..., G_m$ have even multiplicity in u^*R.

A more terse way to put this is that $u : \widehat{U} \to U$ is the minimal birational map with $\widehat{U}$ smooth such that the divisor

$$\widehat{R} = u^*R - 2\left\lfloor \frac{u^*R}{2} \right\rfloor \tag{5.51}$$

is smooth, i.e., a disjoint union of smooth components. Then we take $\widehat{Y}$ to be the double cover $\widehat{U}$ ramified along $\widehat{R}$. It is easy to check that $\widehat{Y}$ is the minimal resolution of Y. We have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{Y} & \xrightarrow{\nu} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle\widehat{\pi}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\pi} \\ \widehat{U} & \xrightarrow{u} & U \end{array} \tag{5.52}$$

From this, we can figure out the discrepancies of $\nu : \widehat{Y} \to Y$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\widehat{Y}} &= \widehat{\pi}^* K_{\widehat{U}} + \frac{1}{2}\widehat{\pi}^*\widehat{R} \\ \omega_Y &= \pi^* K_U + \frac{1}{2}\pi^* R \\ K_{\widehat{U}} &= u^* K_U + \sum a(E,U)E, \end{aligned} \tag{5.53}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\widehat{Y}} &= \widehat{\pi}^* u^* K_U + \sum a(E,U)\widehat{\pi}^* E + \frac{1}{2}\widehat{\pi}^*\widehat{R} \\ &= \nu^*\omega_Y + \sum a(E,U)\widehat{\pi}^* E + \frac{1}{2}\widehat{\pi}^*(\widehat{R} - u^*R) \\ &= \nu^*\omega_Y + \sum a(E,U)\widehat{\pi}^* E - \widehat{\pi}^*\left\lfloor \frac{u^*R}{2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned} \tag{5.54}$$

Clearly, the exceptional divisors of ν is contained in $\sum \widehat{\pi}^* E$ for $E \subset \widehat{U}$ the exceptional divisors of u.

If $\mathrm{mult}_E(u^*R)$ is odd, $\widehat{\pi}$ is ramified along E and hence $\widehat{\pi}^* E = 2F$ for some F with discrepancy

$$a(F, Y) = 2a(E, U) - \mathrm{mult}_E(u^*R) + 1. \tag{5.55}$$

If $\mathrm{mult}_E(u^*R)$ is even, $\widehat{\pi}$ is unramified at a general point of E and each component F of $\widehat{\pi}^* E$ has discrepancy

$$a(F, Y) = a(E, U) - \frac{\mathrm{mult}_E(u^*R)}{2}. \tag{5.56}$$

Remark 5.4. As an example, let us see how a double point of the type $y^2 = x^2 + t^\delta$ is resolved in this way. This is a canonical surface singularity whose resolution is well known. The following diagram shows how to resolve $y^2 = x^2 + t^4$ as a double cover:

(5.57)



Proposition 5.5. *Let $Y = \{y^2 = g(x,t)\} \subset \Delta^3_{xyt}$ be an isolated surface singularity with $g(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x,t]]$ satisfying* (4.46) *and let $\nu : \widehat{Y} \to Y$ be the minimal resolution of Y. Then*

$$\eta(\widehat{Y}_0) + 2b \geq \delta \tag{5.58}$$

where b is the rational number defined as in (5.26)*, i.e.,*

$$b = \max_{F \subset \widehat{Y}_0} \left(0, -\frac{a(F,Y)}{\mathrm{mult}_F(\widehat{Y}_0)}\right). \tag{5.59}$$

Clearly, the above proposition implies (5.49) and thus finishes our proof.

Remark 5.6. For the canonical singularity $Y = \{y^2 = x^2 + t^\delta\}$, it is obvious that $\eta(\widehat{Y}_0) = \delta$ (see (5.57)). It is tempting to think that $\eta(\widehat{Y}_0)$ should go

up as the singularity gets "worse" and thus expect that $\eta(\widehat{Y}_0) \geq \delta$ under the hypotheses of the proposition. However, this is simply false: consider $Y = \{y^2 = x^4 + t^4\}$, which is resolved by the following diagram:

(5.60)



where F is a component of $\widehat{Y}_0$ and a double cover of $E \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ ramified at the 4 points $\widehat{R} \cap E$. Clearly, $\eta(\widehat{Y}_0) = 2 < 4$. On the other hand, F is an elliptic curve satisfying $a(F, Y) = -1$ and hence $b = 1$. Therefore, we have $\eta(\widehat{Y}_0) + 2b = 4 = \delta$. This example shows that the term $2b$ in (5.58) cannot be omitted.

Let $U^{[1]}$ be the blowup of U at the origin $p_0 = \{x = t = 0\}$. Then $u : \widehat{U} \to U$ factors through $U^{[1]}$ if and only if R is singular at p_0. If u factors through $U^{[1]}$, we further blow up $U^{[1]}$ at the point $p_1 = \{x/t = t = 0\}$ to obtain $U^{[2]}$. In this way, we obtain a sequence of blowups

$$\widehat{U} \to U^{[m]} \to ... \to U^{[1]} \to U^{[0]} = U \tag{5.61}$$

where $U^{[j+1]} \to U^{[j]}$ is the blowup of $U^{[j]}$ at the point $p_j = \{x/t^j = t = 0\}$ and m is the largest integer such that u factors through $U^{[m]}$. This gives us the commutative diagram

(5.62)



The choice of m implies that

$$\widehat{R}_m = u_m^* R - 2 \left\lfloor \frac{u_m^* R}{2} \right\rfloor \tag{5.63}$$

either fails to pass through p_m or is smooth at p_m.

The central fiber $U_0^{[m]}$ of $U^{[m]}$ is

$$U_0^{[m]} = E_0 + E_1 + E_2 + ... + E_m, \tag{5.64}$$

where E_0 is the proper transform of U_0 and E_j is the proper transform of the exceptional divisor of $U^{[j]} \to U^{[j-1]}$ for $j = 1, 2, ..., m$. Also

$$u_m^* R = R_m + c_1 E_1 + c_2 E_2 + ... + c_m E_m \tag{5.65}$$

where $R_m \subset U^{[m]}$ is the proper transform of R and $c_j = \mathrm{mult}_{E_j}(u_m^* R)$ (we let $c_j = 0$ if $j < 1$ or $j > m$).

Since $g(0,t) = t^\delta$, $c_m \leq \delta$, obviously. Indeed, $c_m = \delta$ if and only if $p_m \notin R_m$.

5.7.1. *The case $c_m = \delta$.* In this case, E_m is a component satisfying

$$a(E_m, U) = m, \mathrm{mult}_{E_m}(U_0^{[m]}) = 1 \text{ and } \mathrm{mult}_{E_m}(u_m^* R) = \delta \tag{5.66}$$

by (5.64) and (5.65). Combining with (5.55) and (5.56), we obtain

$$b \geq \left\lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \right\rfloor - m. \tag{5.67}$$

Next, let us give a lower bound for $\eta(\widehat{Y}_0)$.

Let $q_j = E_{j-1} \cap E_j$ for $j = 1, 2, ..., m$ and let us consider $Q_j = \widehat{\pi}_m^{-1}(q_j)$. Obviously, Q_j contains at least one singularity of $(\widehat{Y}_0)_{\mathrm{red}}$. Therefore,

$$\eta_0(\widehat{Y}_0, Q_j) = \sum_{q \in Q_j} \eta_0(\widehat{Y}_0, q) \geq 1 \tag{5.68}$$

for all $j = 1, 2, ..., m$.

If $\dim Q_j = 1$, i.e., Q_j contains components of $\widehat{Y}_0$ contracting to q_j, it is not hard to see that Q_j contains at least two distinct singularities of $(\widehat{Y}_0)_{\mathrm{red}}$. Therefore,

$$\eta_0(\widehat{Y}_0, Q_j) \geq 2 \tag{5.69}$$

if $\dim Q_j = 1$. In particular, (5.69) holds when c_{j-1} and c_j are both odd.

If c_{j-1} and c_j are both even and $\dim Q_j = 0$, then Q_j consists of exactly two points, both singularities of $(\widehat{Y}_0)_{\mathrm{red}}$, and hence (5.69) holds again. In summary, we have

$$\eta_0(\widehat{Y}_0, Q_j) \geq \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } 2 \mid (c_{j-1} + c_j) \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.70}$$

If c_j is even, $\widehat{Y}_0$ is reduced along the components that dominate E_j. Thus, if $c_k, c_{k+1}, ..., c_l$ are odd and c_{k-1}, c_{l+1} are even, the divisor $\widehat{Y}_0 - (\widehat{Y}_0)_{\mathrm{red}}$ has a connected component M_{kl} such that M_{kl} is supported on

$$\widehat{\pi}_m^{-1}(E_k \cup E_{k+1} \cup ... \cup E_l). \tag{5.71}$$

Therefore,

$$\eta_1(\widehat{Y}_0) \geq \sum_{k,l} (K_{\widehat{Y}} M_{kl} - M_{kl}^2) \geq \sum_{k,l} 2 \tag{5.72}$$

where the sum runs over all pairs (k,l) of integers satisfying that

$$k \le l, 2 \nmid c_k, c_{k+1}, ..., c_l \text{ and } 2 \mid c_{k-1}, c_{l+1}. \tag{5.73}$$

Combining (5.70) and (5.72), we conclude that

$$\eta(\widehat{Y}_0) \ge \eta_1(\widehat{Y}_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_0(\widehat{Y}_0, Q_j) \ge \begin{cases} 2m & \text{if } 2 \mid c_m \\ 2m+1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.74}$$

Then (5.58) follows from (5.67) and (5.74).

5.7.2. *The case $c_m < \delta$.* This happens when $p_m \in R_m$. Locally at p_m, $u_m^* R$ is given by

$$g(t^m w, t) = t^{c_m} h(w,t) = 0 \tag{5.75}$$

in Δ^2_{wt}, where $R_m = \{h(w,t) = 0\}$. Since $g(0,t) = t^\delta$ and $g_x(0,t) \equiv 0$, $h(0,t) = t^{\delta - c_m}$ and $h_w(0,t) \equiv 0$. And since $\widehat{R}_m$ is smooth at p_m, we conclude that

$$2 \mid c_m = \delta - 1 \text{ and } h(w,0) = w^\mu \tag{5.76}$$

for some $\mu \ge 2$. Geometrically, this says that R_m is tangent to E_m at p_m with multiplicity $\mu \ge 2$. Then $\widehat{\pi}_m^{-1}(p_m)$ consists of a unique point $\widehat{p}_m$ where $\widehat{Y}$ is locally given by $y^2 = w^\mu + t$. Therefore,

$$\eta_0(\widehat{Y}_0, \widehat{p}_m) = \mu - 1 \ge 1. \tag{5.77}$$

Using the same argument as in the previous case, we can prove

$$b \ge \frac{\delta - 1}{2} - m \tag{5.78}$$

and

$$\eta_1(\widehat{Y}_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_0(\widehat{Y}_0, Q_j) \ge 2m. \tag{5.79}$$

Then (5.58) follows from (5.77), (5.78) and (5.79).

References

[B] A. Beauville, L'application canonique pour les surfaces de type général, *Invent. Math.* **55** (1979), no. 2, 121-140.

[F] T. Fujita, On Kähler fibre spaces over curves, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **30** (1978), 779-794.

[H-M] J. Harris and I. Morrison, *Moduli of Curves*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[M] Y. Miyaoka, On the chern numbers of surfaces of general type, *Invent. Math.* **42** (1977), 225-237.

[S] X.T. Sun, On canonical fibrations of algebraic surfaces, *Manuscripta Math.* **83** (1994), no. 2, 161-169.

[X] G. Xiao, Problem list in Birational Geometry of Algebraic Varieties: Open Problems, *XXIII International Symposium, Division of Mathematics, the Taniguchi Foundation* (1988), 36-40.

[Y] S. T. Yau, Calabi's conjecture and some new results in algebraic geometry, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **74** (1977), 1798-1799.

632 Central Academic Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G1, CANADA
E-mail address: xichen@math.ualberta.ca